

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,340 01/19/2006		David W. Old	17609 (AP) PCT-US	2106
7590 02/01/2008 Robert J. Baran Allergan, INC.			EXAMINER	
			SHIAO, RE	SHIAO, REI TSANG
2525 Dupont D T2-7H	rive		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Irvine, CA 92612			1626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		• • • • • • •	02/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

						
•		Application	Application No. Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/565,340		OLD ET AL.		
		Examiner		Art Unit		
		Rei-tsang St	niao, Ph.D.	1626		
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communicate Reply	ation appears on the c	over sheet with the d	correspondence ad	dress	
A SHC WHICI - Extens after S - If NO p - Failure Any re	PRIENT STATUTORY PERIOD FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAI ions of time may be available under the provisions of IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communities to reply within the set or extended period for reply will ply received by the Office later than three months after patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event ication. lory period will apply and will e I, by statute, cause the applica	COMMUNICATION however, may a reply be tir xpire SIX (6) MONTHS from tion to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this co ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
2a) 🔲 🤻	Responsive to communication(s) filed This action is FINAL . 2b Since this application is in condition followed in accordance with the practice)⊠ This action is nor r allowance except fo	r formal matters, pro		e merits is	
Dispositio	on of Claims					
5)	Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) 1-30 are subject to restriction on Papers The specification is objected to by the Endrawing(s) filed on is/ are: an Applicant may not request that any objection of the Claim of the Capital of the Capita	withdrawn from cons and/or election requi Examiner. accepted or b) on to the drawing(s) be	rement. objected to by the held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	SD 4 124(d)	
	he oath or declaration is objected to b			-		
Priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice 3) Inform	s) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	5) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D) Notice of Informal F) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number:

10/565,340 Art Unit: 1626

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are pending in the application.

Election/Restriction

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

Lack of Unity Requirement

- 3. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.
 - Claims 1-30, in part, drawn to compounds/compositions of formula
 (I), wherein the variable Z represents alkyl, cycloalkyl, aromatic radical, or heterocyclic aromatic radical benzo[b]thiophen-2-yl (i.e., formula (IV) represents benzo[b]thiophen-2-yl or 3-chloro-benzo[b]thiophen-2-yl) thereof;

10/565,340 Art Unit: 1626

II. Claims 1-30, in part, drawn compounds/compositions of formula (I), wherein the variable Z represents alkyl, cycloalkyl, aromatic radical, or heterocyclic aromatic

radical benzo[b]thiophen-2-yl thereof; the variable R represents hereof, variables W, Y, R¹, R², and R³ are as defined in claim 1, and methods of use (i.e., treating ocular hypertension). If this group is elected, applicants are requested to elect a single species for the search purpose.

III. Claims 1-30, in part, drawn to compounds/compositions of formula (I), wherein the variable Z represents the formula (IV) of claim 4 thereof, and wherein the variable A represents N, and the variable U represents O or S thereof; the

variable R does <u>not</u> represents Not a variables W, Y, R¹, R², and R³ are as defined in claim 1, and methods of use (i.e., treating ocular hypertension). If this group is elected, applicants are requested to elect a single species for the search purpose. This group is subject further restriction if it is elected.

IV. Claims 1-30, in part, drawn to compounds/compositions of formula (I), containing compounds not compassed in the Group I-III. If this group is elected, applicants

are requested to elect a single species for the search purpose. This group may be subject further restriction if it is elected.

Upon thorough consideration of the claims, the examiner has determined that a lack of unity of invention exists, as defined in Rule 13.

PCT Rule 13.1 states that the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention").

PCT Rule 13.2 states that unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

Annex B, Part 1(a), indicates that the application should relate to only one invention, or if there is more than one invention, inclusion is permitted if they are so linked to form a single general inventive concept.

Annex B, Part 1(b), indicates that "special technical features" means those technical features which as a whole define a contribution over the prior art.

Annex B, Part 1(c), further defines independent and dependent claims. Unity of invention only is concerned in relation to independent claims. Dependent claims are defined as a claim which contains all the features of another claim and is in the same category as the other claim. The category of a claim refers to the classification of claims according to subject matter, e.g. product, process, use, apparatus, means, etc.

Application/Control Number:

10/565,340 Art Unit: 1626

Annex B, Part 1(f) indicates the "Markush practice" of alternatives in a single claim. Part 1(f(i)) indicates the technical interrelationship and the same or corresponding special technical feature is considered to be met when: (A) all alternatives have a common property or activity, and (B) a common structure is present or all alternatives belong to a recognized class of chemical compounds. Further defining (B) in Annex B, Part 1(f)(i-iii), the common structure must; a) occupy a large portion of their structure, or b) the common structure constitutes a structurally distinctive portion, or c) where the structures are equivalent and therefore a recognized class of chemical compounds, each member could be substituted for one another with the same intended result. That is, with a common or equivalent structure, there is an expectation from knowledge in the art that all members will behave in the same way. Thus, the technical relationship and the corresponding special technical feature result from a common (or equivalent) structure which is responsible for the common activity (or property). Part 1(f(iv)) indicates that when all alternatives of a Markush grouping can be differently classified, it shall not, taken alone, be considered justification for finding a lack of unity. Part 1(f(v)) indicates that when dealing with alternatives, it can be shown that at least one Markush alternative is not novel over the prior art, the question of unity of invention shall be reconsidered, but does not imply that an objection shall be raised.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted. Again, this list is not exhaustive, as it would be impossible under the time constraints due to the sheer volume of subject matter instantly claimed. Therefore, applicant may choose to elect a

Application/Control Number:

10/565,340 Art Unit: 1626

single invention by identifying another specific embodiment not listed in the exemplary groups of the invention and examiner will endeavor to group the same.

The claims herein lack unity of invention under PCT rule 13.1 and 13.2 since the compounds defined in the claims lack a significant structural element qualifying as the special technical feature that defines a contribution over the prior art, see Conrow's US 6,531,614. Accordingly, unity of invention is considered to be lacking and restriction of the invention in accordance with the rules of unit of invention is considered to be proper. Additionally, the vastness of the claimed subject matter, and the complications in understanding the claimed subject matter impose a burden on any examination of the claimed subject matter.

4. Applicants are advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rei-tsang Shiao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0707. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph K. McKane can be reached on (571) 272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rei-tsang Shiao, Ph.D.

Primary Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1626